DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 467 RC 021 551

AUTHOR	Marshall, Catherine A.; Gotto, George S., IV
TITLE	Developing Rehabilitation Researchers in the American Indian Community: A Technical Report of Consumer-Researcher Training.
INSTITUTION	Northern Arizona Univ., Flagstaff. American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
ISBN	ISBN-1-888557-76-1
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	91p.
CONTRACT	H133B30068
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*American Indians; *Community Involvement; *Disabilities; Feasibility Studies; Models; Nonprofessional Personnel; *Participatory Research; Rehabilitation Programs; *Research Projects; *Researchers
IDENTIFIERS	*Research Training

ABSTRACT

This report describes a 3-year research project that developed a community-based consumer-researcher training model and subsequently trained an American Indian consumer-researcher team in Eagle Butte, South Dakota. For this project, consumers were defined as American Indians with disabilities, their families, and rehabilitation service providers. The training model consisted of four sections: overview of the research process, developing a research proposal, research design and data analysis, and evaluation and dissemination. The trainees participated in four training sessions based on the model and evaluated each session and its efficacy. An introduction summarizes relevant literature. A section on methodology specifies questions to be answered; roles of the project advisory committee and on-site coordinator; the subject population/participants; and procedural steps of developing the training model, recruiting trainees, developing training manuals, conducting the training sessions, and providing technical assistance for trainee projects. Descriptions of the training sessions include participants' evaluations of training, facilities, presenter, sessions, impact of the workshop, and comments and suggestions. It is concluded that with systematic training, American Indians with disabilities could take a more active role in research for and about them. Recommendations relate to cultural relevance and sensitivity, preparation time, number of trainees, trainee recruitment, the training site, and the on-site coordinator. Appendixes include pretraining interview profile and formative evaluation forms. Contains 21 references and 5 evaluation summary tables. (Author/SAS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 420 467

Developing Rehabilitation Researchers in the American Indian Community

A Technical Report of Consumer-Researcher Training

1998

Principal Investigator: Catherine A. Marshall, Ph.D., CRC

Co-Investigator: George S. Gotto, IV, M.A.

American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center

Institute for Human Development
University Affiliated Program
PO Box 5630
Flagstaff, Arizona 86011

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Funded by the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)
Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC
Grant No. H133B30068

The contents of this report are the responsibility of the American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center and no official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education should be inferred.

Northern Arizona University is an Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action Institution

RC 021551

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Developing Rehabilitation Researchers in the American Indian Community

A Technical Report of Consumer-Researcher Training

1998

Principal Investigator: Catherine A. Marshall, Ph.D., CRC

Co-Investigator: George S. Gotto, IV, M.A.

(Project Number R-42)

Northern Arizona University
Institute for Human Development
University Affiliated Program
American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center
PO Box 5630
Flagstaff, Arizona 86011
(520) 523-4791

ISBN 1-888557-76-1

This report is available in alternate formats by contacting the Institute for Human Development at (520) 523-4791.

RC 021551

Table of Contents

List of Tables v

Acknowledgments vi

Abstract viii

INTRODUCTION 1

Summary of Relevant Literature 2

METHODOLOGY 4

Research Questions 5

Project Advisory Committee 6

On-Site Coordinator 7

Subject Population/Participants 7

Procedures 9

Specific Steps Involved in Developing the Training Model 10

Development of the Project Advisory Committee 10

Recruitment of Consumer-Researcher Trainees 13

Development of the Training Manuals 16

Conducting the Training Sessions 17

Providing Technical Assistance 18

THE CONSUMER-RESEARCHER TRAINING 20

Results of Formative Evaluation Surveys 20

Training Session I 20

Participants' Evaluation 21

Training 21

Facilities 21

Presenter 21

Sessions 23

Impact of workshop 24
Comments and suggestions 24
Training Session II 25
Participants' Evaluation 26
Training 26
Facilities 26
Presenter 28
Sessions 28
Impact of workshop 29
Comments and suggestions 29
Training Session III 30
Participants' Evaluation 32
Training 32
Facilities 32
Presenter 32
Sessions 32
Impact of workshop 34
Comments and suggestions 35
Training Session IV 36
Participants' Evaluation 36
Training 36
Facilities 37
Presenter 37
Sessions 37
Impact of workshop 37
Comments and suggestions 39
Summary of All Training Sessions 40

Personal Essays 42
Pre-Training Personal Essay 42
Post-Training Personal Essay 43
Review of Pre- and Post-Training Presentations 46
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS 49
RECOMMENDATIONS 53
References 55
Appendix A: Letters of Support 58
Appendix B: Interview Questions with KOSZ Radio 63
Appendix C: Press Release 66
Appendix D: Pre-Training Interview/Profile 68
Appendix E: Formative Evaluation 78

List of Tables

Table 1 Evaluation Results: Training Session I 22

Table 2 Evaluation Results: Training Session II 27

Table 3 Evaluation Results: Training Session III 33

Table 4 Evaluation Results: Training Session IV 38

Table 5 Evaluation Results: Average of All Training Sessions 41

Acknowledgments

The successful completion of this project would not have been possible without the assistance, support, and guidance of many people. The authors would like to thank Ms. Julie Anna Clay, research specialist at the AIRRTC, for the considerable amount of work that she put into this project during the development of the project advisory committee and the first training manual. Ms. Amy Wiggins, administrative secretary at the AIRRTC, was instrumental in the development of the training manuals. The authors' deepest appreciation goes out to her. Thanks also go to Ms. Priscilla Sanderson, director of the AIRRTC, who put together a panel of vocational rehabilitation researchers and counselors to review the pre- and post-training video presentations. Many thanks go out to the members of this expert panel. They were Tim Sanderson, Julie Clay, Eileen Johnson, Wes Hanson, Bill Olney, and Rebecca Vanderbilt. This project would not have happened if it were not for the consumer researcher trainees. Many thanks go out to them. Finally, the project advisory committee was extremely helpful and our most sincere thanks go out to them. The members of the project advisory committee are listed on the following page.

Project Advisory Committee Members

Georgia Amiotte,
Administrative Officer
Kyle PHS Health Center
Kyle, South Dakota

Ron Dolin, Manager
Employment Resources
Rapid City, South Dakota

Glade Jones, Director
Western Resources for Disabled
Independence
Rapid City, South Dakota

Terry L. Janis, J.D., Director
Institute for Native Americans
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, Arizona

Dr. Arther Zimimga
Rapid City Indian Health Board
Rapid City, South Dakota

John Mills
Black Hills Special Services
Sturgis, South Dakota

Gregg Bourland, Chairperson
Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
Eagle Butte, South Dakota

Michelle Coats
Porcupine, South Dakota

Sydney Claymore, Project Director
Tataya Topa Ho
Fort Yates, North Dakota

Gayla Twiss, Service Unit Director
Rose PHS Indian Hospital
Rosebud, South Dakota

Jolene Peterson
Social Services
Pine Ridge Hospital
Pine Ridge, South Dakota

Patty Mechling, Director
IMPACT-West Program
Behavior Management Systems
Rapid City, South Dakota

Nancy Shade, Director
Client Assistance Program
South Dakota Advocacy Services
Pierre, South Dakota

Abstract

This report discusses the primary components of a multi-year research project; specifically, the report addresses the development of a community-based consumer-researcher training model and the subsequent training of a consumer-research team in Eagle Butte, South Dakota. The training model that was developed consisted of four sections that focused on an overview of the research process, developing a research proposal, research design and data analysis, and evaluation and dissemination. The consumer-researcher trainees participated in four training sessions that were based on the four sections of the training model. Following each training session, the consumer-researcher trainees evaluated the training and its efficacy. These evaluations are also discussed in this report. A subsequent final report is anticipated that will address the outcome of the overall research effort, including answers to all research questions.

Developing Rehabilitation Researchers in the American Indian Community

It has been the experience of the American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (AIRRTC) researchers that indigenous people in the community can make significant contributions to the design and process of research (see, e.g., Marshall, Johnson, Martin, Saravanabhavan, & Bradford, 1992; Marshall, Day-Davila, & Mackin, 1992; Marshall, Gotto, Pérez Cruz, Flores Rey, & García Juárez, 1996; Marshall, Gotto, & Galicia García, 1997; Schacht, Hickman, & Klibaner, 1993; Schacht, Morris, & Gaseoma, 1994). Through field research, AIRRTC researchers have had the opportunity to train American Indian community members, with no previous exposure to research, in data collection procedures, and afterwards, have heard their many stories of positive experiences and willingness to engage in further research activity. However, one must question how "participatory" the research process really can be if the consumer has had no training whatsoever in the myriad of options available for design, analysis, and dissemination. It is believed that systematic training will allow consumers to be better informed and more active participants in research. Thus, the purpose of this research was to:

1. Develop a consumer-researcher training model with which to systematically train consumers in the process of research.
2. Test the model in one community, Rapid City, South Dakota.

3. Provide technical assistance to the consumer-research team as regards conducting a research project in their community, focused on identifying the needs of American Indians with disabilities.
4. Evaluate both the process of training consumers, as well as the outcome of their research effort.

This technical report will focus on the first two purposes of the research project. Specifically, it will outline each of the four consumer-researcher training sessions and offer recommendations for future training models. Outcomes associated with the remainder of the purpose statement (3 and 4) will be discussed in the project's final report.

Summary of Relevant Literature

Participatory action research has been described as "a continuous, mutual learning strategy" (Graves, 1992, p. 223). AIRRTC researchers and consumers have learned a great deal about research from working together over the AIRRTC's 14-year history. While AIRRTC researchers value the contributions of American Indians with disabilities who may not have received formal training in research, it is believed that our working relationships, as well as the possibility of consumers conducting their own research, can only be enhanced by researchers systematically training consumers in the availability of various research methodologies and data analysis procedures. Nichter (1984) described a participatory research effort conducted in India in which "a group of lay persons expressing interest in community development" were trained in research skills such as participant observation and survey interviewing "through training exercises and active modeling" (p. 238). After the research effort was completed, Nichter stated that "what remains to be tested is whether such teams once organized and

offered rudimentary social science field training can function independently with a limited amount of support and supervision from professional social scientists" (p. 247).

A similar, but perhaps more structured community-based research training program was carried out by staff of the Pacific Basin Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (PBRRTC) in Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia (Fitzgerald, Goebert, Tipene-Leach, & Dever, n.d.). The PBRRTC developed a four-week rehabilitation research course as part of a five-year community-based training program of indigenous physicians in the U.S. associated regions of the Pacific. The course was divided into two-week segments, with five to six months between segments, and focused on problem identification, data collection, analysis, and dissemination. The goals of the course were "to increase community, rehabilitation, and research awareness among the students" (Fitzgerald, Goebert, Tipene-Leach, & Dever, n.d., p. 3); however, PBRRTC researchers stated that "the full effectiveness of this course probably cannot be measured until after the students have been in practice for a few years."

More research, training, and intervention programs are needed in local Indian communities than can possibly be provided by university-based researchers. Nor would it be appropriate for university-based researchers to attempt to meet the needs of American Indians with disabilities without the active involvement of local community members. In participatory research, as in collaborative research:

> It is essential that the participants eventually work together as equals; this equality has to occur with respect to finances, social relationships, and the exchange of knowledge. The outside professionals and the local people work together as a team since the different kinds of

knowledge each party contributes to the work are complementary and need to be pooled. Each member is an authority in his or her area and instructs the other participants (Kuhlmann, 1992, p.277).

Nichter (1984) has noted that:

> While involved with the routine if not the struggle of life, it is difficult to step back and see one's life and immediate personal needs in relation to broader community needs. . . . Participatory research affords an opportunity for community representatives to reflect on their experience of life and to share their reflections with others (p. 249).

In referring to the collaborative research process, Kuhlmann (1992) stated that:

> Success is not so much measured in terms of completed products, although they are also important; the emphasis is on non-material criteria of success, including the quality of the relationship between the members of the research team and the knowledge and skills learned by all participants. The success or failure of the collaborative effort becomes apparent when the project continues even when the academic participants leave, . . . and, eventually, when the local people do such work themselves (p. 277).

METHODOLOGY

This project proposed to develop a consumer-researcher training model, and to test and evaluate the model in one community with a large American Indian population. The community that was originally selected for the project was Rapid City, South Dakota. However, the consumer-researcher trainees who participated in the project were from Eagle Butte, South Dakota, capital of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation (see also, "Conducting the

Training Sessions"). Due to the hard winters and poor road conditions in the winter, the consumer-researcher trainees asked that the training sessions be moved to Eagle Butte, South Dakota. Upon their request, the training sessions were moved to Eagle Butte.

The consumer-researcher training model was developed in conjunction with Indian leadership in South Dakota to ensure congruence with local cultural values and world view. The training model took the form of a structured curriculum, covering basic options for research design (e.g., quantitative vs. qualitative, evaluation studies, survey research, single-subject, etc.), as well as basic issues in measurement and research ethics (see, e.g. Berger & Patchner, 1988; Fowler, 1984; Fowler & Mangione, 1990; Guyette, 1983; Leedy, 1993; Marshall & Rossman, 1989). Consumers were also given an overview of data analysis procedures (see, e.g., Berven & Scofield, 1982; Fielding & Lee, 1991; Strauss, 1987), and instruction in the preparation of a research report (see, e.g., Huck, Cormier, & Bounds, 1974; Wolcott, 1990). The training manuals that were used for the four training sessions are available through the AIRRTC (Institute for Human Development, Northern Arizona University, PO Box 5630, Flagstaff, Arizona 86011-5630).

Researchers worked with the community-research team to identify a researchable problem related to American Indians with disabilities, and are now assisting the team with data collection, analysis, and dissemination. Dissemination will include both written reports and verbal presentations.

Research Questions

The following are research questions that helped to guide the research process:

1. What aspects of the consumer-researcher training model are most effective in developing researchers within the context of the cultural values and world view of the targeted community?
2. What specific strategies facilitate the learning process when training American Indians in rehabilitation research?
3. What specific barriers come into play when training American Indians in rehabilitation research?
4. What specific strategies facilitate the implementation of a community research project carried out by a consumer-research team?
5. What specific barriers restrict the implementation of a community research project carried out by a consumer research team?

The research questions will be thoroughly discussed in the project's final report, which will follow the conclusion of the research.

Project Advisory Committee

One of the first tasks that faced AIRRTC researchers was the development of a Project Advisory Committee (PAC). The purpose of the PAC was to provide input regarding the development of the four training manuals, assist in locating Native people with disabilities who would be interested in participating in the project as consumer-researcher trainees, and review all written documents that result from the project. Ultimately, 13 people agreed to serve on the PAC. The members of the PAC were tribal officials, health and social service professionals, and American Indians with disabilities (see Appendix A for letters of support).

On-Site Coordinator

Because the AIRRTC researchers were based in Flagstaff, Arizona and the site for this project was to be in Rapid City, South Dakota, an on-site coordinator was hired. The responsibilities of the on-site coordinator were to: 1) contact sponsoring agencies that were hosting the training sessions to insure that the training facilities would be ready; 2) be available to the consumer-researcher trainees in order to answer any questions that they may have had and to direct them to any resources that they may have needed; 3) be available to the PAC members to answer any questions that they may have had; 4) conduct the pre-training interviews/profile with the consumer-researcher trainees; and 5) help the AIRRTC researchers to identify any resources that may have helped them with the training sessions. The on-site coordinator was an important link to the community and could have assisted greatly in the success of the project. Unfortunately for this project, the person who was hired as the on-site coordinator was offered a full-time teaching position and therefore had to resign. Another on-site coordinator was not hired because the training sessions had begun and there was not a sufficient amount of time to hire and train a new person.

Subject Population/Participants

For the purpose of this project, consumers were defined as American Indians with disabilities, their family members, and rehabilitation service providers. Consumers were identified for participation in the project through Indian community leaders, advertisements on South Dakota radio stations (see Appendix B) and newspapers (see Appendix C), the help of PAC members, as well as community health and rehabilitation service agencies such as the Section 130 projects on reservations in South Dakota. In addition,

one of the AIRRTC researchers traveled to South Dakota in July, 1996, where he met with PAC members and potential consumer-researcher trainees.

Researchers encouraged the participation of several persons having a range of disabling conditions, including, for example, persons with emotional disorders, persons with learning disabilities, as well as persons with severe physical disabilities. Ultimately, two people with disabilities completed the four, ten-hour training sessions. The two consumer-researchers were both members of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe. One of the consumer-researcher trainees was a 54-year old woman with a bachelors degree. The other consumer-researcher trainee was a 44-year old man who had some college experience. In addition, they both had disabilities; one trainee had diabetes and the other an amputation. Neither of the consumer-researcher trainees had previous experience in conducting research. However, one of the consumer-researcher trainees felt that American Indians had been abused by outside researchers in the past and believed that research training could help empower American Indians. These comments were expressed in a pre-training profile (see Appendix D):

> *I do have an issue with the way American Indians are the subjects of research for someone else's gain, not for theirs. I'm excited because as more grass roots people learn about research the more it can be used to empower Native people.*

Consumer-researcher trainees were asked to rate their confidence in their ability to conduct research in the pre-training profile. They rated themselves on a scale that ranged from zero to 100, with zero indicating no confidence and 100 indicating complete confidence (see Appendix D for an example of the scale). Despite their lack of research experience, both consumer-researcher trainees felt relatively confident that they would be able

to complete a research project. For example, when asked how confident they were that they could "complete a significant research project," one person gave a score of 90 and the other a score of 70.

Procedures

As indicated earlier, a pre-training profile of each consumer participant was developed. Information for the profile was based on data such as education level and work experience, academic exposure to research processes, actual experience in research, aptitude for research [see, e.g. "Personal Research Aptitude Test" (Leedy, 1993)], and conceptual understanding of research issues. Samples of pre-training writing skills and presentation skills (documented through video) were obtained. Post-training profiles, as well as samples of post-training writing and presentation skills, were collected at the end of training in February, 1997 and should be collected again in a one year follow-up at the conclusion of the consumer research project on March 25, 1998; however, these components of the summative evaluation and the project's final report are contingent on the refunding of the AIRRTC. In addition to pre- and post-training profiles, data have been collected through formative evaluation surveys completed by trainees after each training module (see Appendix E); a summative evaluation survey will be completed by trainees following the conclusion of the consumer research project. The summative data will allow researchers to measure the participants' acquisition of skills and knowledge and to identify characteristics of consumer-trainees which contributed to successful outcomes. A detailed account of the processes involved in the implementation of the community research project will be documented in a final report.

Specific Steps Involved in Developing the Training Model

There were five major tasks that had to be completed in order to develop and carry out the consumer-researcher training. These five tasks were: 1) development of the PAC, 2) recruitment of consumer-researcher trainees, 3) development of the training manuals, 4) conducting the four training sessions, and 5) providing technical assistance to the consumer-researchers as they conducted their own research project. The AIRRTC researchers accomplished each of the first four tasks with varying degrees of success; the last task, providing technical assistance, is under way.

Development of the Project Advisory Committee

As was reported earlier, one of the first tasks that faced the AIRRTC researchers was the development the PAC. The AIRRTC is committed to conducting research that is culturally appropriate by including local people in the research process from design, to instrument development, to data collection, to dissemination. This process is known as Participatory Action Research (PAR) and herein lies the importance of the PAC. Guyette (1983) wrote that "there must be a process of feed-back from the community to outside researchers, so that information and suggestions for improvement of research methods are not lost. This creates a balance between researchers and those researched and increases the chances of true reciprocation" (p. 273). Members of the PAC are key elements in the community feedback process.

The AIRRTC researchers employed methods such as letter writing, telephone calls, and press releases in order to recruit PAC members. Initially, approximately 20 letters of invitation were sent to people, including the following: South Dakota tribal college presidents; University of South Dakota, Native American Studies Department Chairperson; IHS Service Unit Directors and the Area Office Director; Independent Living Centers; the state

Vocational Rehabilitation director; and two tribal VR program directors located in South Dakota. Two people responded to the letter of invitation and agreed to be on the PAC. Both were apprised of the PAC responsibilities and time commitments. Follow-up telephone calls to the people who received a letter of invitation to be on the PAC resulted in the commitment of five additional people. Appendix A contains letters of support from PAC members and/or their organizations.

In addition to the letter writing campaign, a press release describing the project was submitted to 189 newspapers and radio stations across South Dakota (see Appendix C). The purpose of the press release was to recruit PAC members, as well as consumer-researcher trainees. As a result of the press release, a journalist from KOSZ radio station in Vermillion, South Dakota requested an interview with AIRRTC researchers. Several AIRRTC staff members answered questions posed by the radio journalist during a live interview on February 7, 1996 (see Appendix B). Four people called or wrote to request more information on the project as a result of the press release.

Even though recruiting the PAC was quite successful, actually getting them involved in the project was not as successful. The primary reasons for this lack of involvement were time constraints on both the AIRRTC researchers and the PAC members. For example, the PAC members also had full-time jobs and families that for obvious reasons took precedence over being a member of the PAC. As a result of the conflicting responsibilities and time constraints on the AIRRTC researchers and the PAC, deadlines were missed and some project activities were modified from the original proposal. For example, the training curriculum for this project was contained within four separate training manuals developed by the researchers. In an effort to

adhere to the principles of participatory action research, the original proposal called for the PAC to review and comment on each of the training manuals.

In order to accomplish this task, a draft of the manuals had to be printed and then sent out to each PAC member; the PAC members had to read the lengthy drafts and make comments; and then the PAC members had to send them back to the AIRRTC researchers, take part in a conference call, or talk individually with one of the AIRRTC researchers. If all of this was done using the postal service, approximately two weeks were spent while the manuals were being mailed either to or from the PAC members, with the PAC members needing an additional week to review a given training manual. This adds up to nearly a month, under the best of circumstances, to review one manual.

A conference call with all or even part of the PAC was nearly impossible because everyone involved had a full-time job, making it difficult to plan such a meeting without two or three weeks advanced notice. Again, this adds up to nearly a month, under the best of circumstances, to review one manual. Calling each of the PAC members individually was a bit more manageable. However, the manuals still had to be mailed, the PAC members still needed at least a week to review the manuals, and the individual telephone calls still had to be scheduled. Again, nearly a month was needed to review one draft training manual.

As is evidenced in this example, the AIRRTC researchers were forced to choose between adhering to their goal of conducting research that is fully participatory by including local people in each step of the research process or meeting the deadlines that permit the research to be accomplished given funding and time constraints. As a result of choices that were made to move

the project along a reasonable time frame, the PAC was not fully included in all aspects of the development of the training model.

Recruitment of Consumer-Researcher Trainees

AIRRTC researchers encouraged the participation of American Indians with disabilities, their family members, and rehabilitation service providers. Originally, the number of people who were expected to participate in the project as consumer-researcher trainees was between 8 and 12. As a result of this expectation, it was disappointing to only recruit two participants. Several steps were taken to recruit the expected number of participants, but as time began to run out, the AIRRTC researchers were forced to proceed with only two participants. It is difficult to pinpoint the reason for the low number of participants, but perhaps a look at the steps that were taken to recruit participants will shed some light on the obstacles.

Initially, the AIRRTC researchers had two avenues available to them for reaching potential consumer-researcher trainees. These avenues were the PAC and the media. Once one person had been recruited to participate in the project as a consumer-researcher trainee, a third avenue opened. The PAC was an excellent source for identifying potential consumer-researcher trainees because all of the members were either social service or health care providers, vocational rehabilitation professionals, or themselves American Indians with disabilities. Therefore, they had daily contact with potential participants. Indeed, the PAC members did put the AIRRTC researchers in contact with people who were potentially interested in participating in the project. For example, one of the AIRRTC researchers, George Gotto, traveled to Rapid City, South Dakota in July, 1996 in an effort to meet with PAC members about the project and to recruit consumer-researcher trainees. Following a meeting with PAC member Ron Dolin, Manager of Employment Resources, an

organization that provides employment opportunities for people with disabilities, Mr. Dolin introduced Mr. Gotto to a man who was interested in learning more about the project. After meeting with Mr. Gotto, this man said that he wanted to participate in the project. However, before the training sessions started, he found a full-time job and had to back out of the project due to time constraints.

A second PAC member, Nancy Shade, Director of the Client Assistance Program at South Dakota Advocacy Services, worked very hard to recruit participants. Ms. Shade knew of three American Indian college students with disabilities who expressed an interest in the project. It was assumed that these students would have an added motivation for participating in the project since they would be able to get college credits for participating in the course. Unfortunately, these students lived outside of Rapid City and did not have access to transportation to Rapid City. Another concern that they expressed was the cost of both food and lodging while they were in Rapid City. These are just two of many examples of the effort that the PAC members put into the recruitment of consumer-researcher trainees. Ultimately, one of the two people who did participate in the project as a consumer-researcher trainee was referred to the AIRRTC researchers by a PAC member. Mr. Gregg Bourland, Chairman of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, gave the information to individuals on the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation who he thought would have an interest in the project. One woman was very interested in the project and met with George Gotto in Rapid City in July, 1996. Following the meeting with Mr. Gotto, she agreed to participate in the project as a consumer-researcher trainee.

The second avenue for recruiting participants was the media. As was mentioned earlier, a press release describing the project was submitted to 189

newspapers and radio stations across South Dakota (see Appendix C). In addition, AIRRTC researchers participated in an interview with a reporter from KOSZ radio station in Vermillion, South Dakota (see Appendix B). Even though this effort resulted in four requests for information, only one person continued his correspondence with the AIRRTC researchers once he received the information. This man was so interested in the project that he filled out the pre-training profile/interview and sent it in to the AIRRTC. In addition, George Gotto traveled to his home in July, 1996 to meet with him and talk about the project. Mr. Gotto spoke with this man again over the telephone on several occasions and fully anticipated his participation in the project. Two days before the first training, Mr. Gotto spoke with him to discuss any special needs that he had, and again he confirmed his participation. However, on the day of the training session, he did not arrive. This man lived on a reservation approximately 90 miles outside of Rapid City. In later communications with him, AIRRTC researchers learned that his transportation to Rapid City fell through and he would not be able make it to subsequent training sessions for the same reason.

The final avenue for contacting participants was networking through people who had already committed to participating in the project as consumer-researcher trainees. This is the way in which the second trainee was recruited. This man lived on the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation and was acquainted with the woman who had already agreed to participate in the project. She described the project to him and encouraged him to participate, which he ultimately did.

Despite the efforts made by the PAC and the AIRRTC researchers, only two people were recruited who fulfilled the commitment to participate in the project as trainees. However, the two people who did participate brought

with them a wealth of life experience and an excitement for learning about ways in which they could help improve their community. Each of them indicated in their pre-training profiles and in personal communication that their primary reason for participating in the project was to find a way to improve and empower their community.

Development of the Training Manuals

The curriculum for this project was contained within four separate training manuals. The titles for the training manuals were, "Overview of the Research Process," "Developing a Research Proposal," "Research Design and Data Analysis," and "Evaluation and Dissemination;" each of the manuals are available from the AIRRTC. The basis for each of the training manuals was a book by Susan Guyette (1983) entitled "Community-Based Research: A Handbook for Native Americans." The AIRRTC researchers also added information based on their own knowledge and experiences. In addition, each training manual contained several relevant articles that highlighted the training information. Each of the manuals contained between 200 and 400 pages of information about the research process.

The development of content for each training manual took at least a month of full-time work by an AIRRTC researcher. Once the content was completed, a rough draft was channeled to the AIRRTC support staff who formatted the training manuals. This usually took one week. Then the draft was sent to the AIRRTC Research Director and the AIRRTC Director for review and approval. This generally took between a week and two weeks. Thus, the in-house development of one training manual took approximately two months. When this is added to the month that it took for the PAC to review a final draft of a manual, one can see that the development process for one training manual took three months.

The first training manual was developed following the procedures that are described above. However, it was apparent that changes needed to be made in order to complete the project in a timely manner. As a result, the last three manuals contained less information and the AIRRTC researchers received less input from the PAC--a compromise made in order to complete the project by the end of the AIRRTC funding cycle.

Conducting the Training Sessions

The rewards of this project were found in the training sessions. After months of recruitment and development, the goals of the project came to fruition. As was mentioned previously, the training sessions were based on the information contained within the training manuals and the participants were from the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe. The interest and enthusiasm that these two people had lead to the successful completion of the four training sessions. However, despite the overall success of the training sessions, there were a few factors in the process from which much may be learned.

The AIRRTC did not budget the money to pay for transportation and lodging for the consumer-researcher trainees as the proposal and funded project called for all trainees to be from Rapid City and for the training to take place in Rapid City. Subsequently, AIRRTC research staff advocated a statewide "inclusive" approach to recruiting trainees rather than a Rapid City "exclusive" approach. Thus while the first training session took place in Rapid City, neither trainee that ultimately participated resided there and other potential trainees failed to attend. Indeed, Rapid City is approximately 170 miles west of Eagle Butte, the hometown for both of the trainees. This meant that the two trainees had to travel 340 miles round trip, as well as pay for fuel, lodging, and some food expenses (the AIRRTC was able to buy lunch

for the consumer-researcher trainees during the training sessions). Therefore, the trainees requested that the trainings be moved to their home town of Eagle Butte, South Dakota. This was not a problem for the AIRRTC researchers who were already traveling several hundreds of miles just to get to South Dakota, so the site change was made.

Changing the site of the training sessions was, in general, a good move. However, the remaining training sessions took place at the workplace of both consumer-researcher trainees. The problems that arose out of holding the training sessions at the consumer-researchers' workplace were things such as important phone calls that needed to be taken, interruptions by customers who wanted to speak with them, and interruptions by their co-workers who had questions for the trainees.

The winter of 1996-97 was extremely harsh in South Dakota. The training sessions for this project took place between the months of October, 1996 and February, 1997. One result of this was that in one instance, an AIRRTC researcher was stranded in Pierre, South Dakota for a week in November and was unable to conduct the second training session at that time. Unfortunately, this cost both time and money to a project that had little of either. Although scheduling the training sessions during the winter months was unavoidable due to the flow of the research effort, it would have been better because of environmental reasons if they had been scheduled during the spring, summer, or fall.

Providing Technical Assistance

Following the four training sessions, the consumer-researcher trainees were expected to become consumer-researchers and as such, develop and carry out their own research project. The AIRRTC was able to provide the funding for the project that they developed. The topic for the research project

that the consumer-researchers developed was confidentiality. The purpose of their investigation was to discover if concern for confidentiality influenced the usage of all social and/or health care services on the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation. For the purposes of their investigation, the consumer-researchers defined confidentiality as: entrusting personal, intimate, and/or private information to the staff of social and/or health care service programs on the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation. As professionals, who themselves are entrusted with personal information about their clients and who want to serve their clients in the best way possible, the consumer-researchers were particularly interested in the results of this investigation.

The role of the AIRRTC researchers in the development of this community research project was to provide technical assistance as needed. This meant that if the consumer-researchers had any questions about the research process, they could ask the AIRRTC researchers for advice or assistance. For example, one AIRRTC researcher made two trips to Eagle Butte in order to provide technical assistance. On the first technical assistance trip in June, 1997, the AIRRTC researcher assisted the consumer-researchers with the development of their sequential work plan, their survey instrument, and the selection of their research sample. The second technical assistance trip occurred in November, 1997 after the consumer-researchers had conducted the survey, and focused on setting up a data base for statistical analysis and developing an outline for the report of their research results.

For the AIRRTC researchers, the most difficult part about providing technical assistance was taking a "hands-off" approach. Up to this point in the project, the AIRRTC researchers had been directly responsible for everything that had happened in terms of providing the research training. It proved to be personally difficult to relinquish control of the project and let

the consumer-researchers conduct their research with minimal support from the AIRRTC researchers.

THE CONSUMER-RESEARCHER TRAINING

Results of Formative Evaluation Surveys

Training Session I

The first training session, entitled "Overview of the Research Process," was conducted in Rapid City, South Dakota on October 17 and October 18, 1996. The discussion topics for this training session were, "The Nature of Research," "Cooperative Efforts With Researchers," and "Needs Assessments." The training session was held at the Black Hills Training Center, which is housed at the Sioux San Hospital in Rapid City, South Dakota.

The first section of this training session focused on the nature of research. In this session, the discussion revolved around the basics of research, such as the different types of research and the parts of a research plan. In addition, bias in research, common errors made in developing a research plan, and practical applications of research results were discussed.

Cooperative efforts with researchers was the discussion topic for the second section of the training session. In this session, the different approaches for working collaboratively towards social change, such as participatory action research, were discussed in detail. Topics included: forming an advisory committee, ethical considerations, group participation in the problem definition, and writing the methodology for the research plan.

The third section of this training session focused on needs assessments. This session included discussions on the steps in conducting a needs assessment, approaches to gathering data, and presenting the data.

The training manual that was used as a guide for this training session was based on a book by Susan Guyette which is entitled, *Community-Based Research: A Handbook for Native Americans*. Permission to use this book was granted by the American Indian Studies Center, UCLA and the Regents of the University of California.

Participants' Evaluation

Following the training session, which was comprised of two five-hour sessions, the participants were asked to evaluate the session. The participants rated the training, facilities, presenter, sessions, and impact of the workshop on a five-point lickert scale, where 1 = poor and 5 = excellent (see Appendix E). In addition, the participants were responded to six open-ended questions. The results of the evaluation were quite positive (see Table 1).

Training. As was mentioned earlier, the training covered the topics of "The Nature of Research," "Cooperative Efforts With Researchers," and "Needs Assessments." The participants were asked to rate the effectiveness of the training based on nine categories. The average score for this section of the evaluation was 4.8 on a 5-point scale. Please refer to Table 1 to review the average score given for each question.

Facilities. As was mentioned earlier, the training session was held at the Black Hills Training Center, which is housed at the Sioux San Hospital in Rapid City, South Dakota. The participants were asked to rate the facilities based on the categories that are listed in Table 1. Although the facilities were rated relatively high, they were rated lower than all other categories except "Impact of Workshop." The average score given for the facilities was 4.5.

Presenter. The participants were only asked to comment on four aspects of the presenter. These aspects were: prepared and organized,

Table 1

Evaluation Results: Training Session I

	Participant A	Participant B	Average
Training	**5.0**	**4.5**	**4.8**
Quality of information provided	5.0	4.0	4.5
Appropriate topics	5.0	5.0	5.0
Amount of information provided	5.0	4.0	4.5
Organization and structure	5.0	4.0	4.5
Handouts	5.0	5.0	5.0
Met stated goals and objectives	5.0	4.0	4.5
Content matched agenda	5.0	5.0	5.0
Overall quality of speakers/sessions	5.0	5.0	5.0
Overall quality of workshop	5.0	5.0	5.0
Facilities	**5.0**	**4.0**	**4.5**
Geographic location	5.0	4.0	4.5
Physical arrangement of room	5.0	4.0	4.5
Temperature	5.0	3.0	4.0
Lighting	5.0	4.0	4.5
Acoustics/sound	5.0	4.0	4.5
Accessibility for people with disabilities	5.0	5.0	5.0
Meeting room facilities in general	5.0	4.0	4.5
Presenter	**5.0**	**5.0**	**5.0**
Prepared and organized	5.0	5.0	5.0
Knowledgeable about subject	5.0	5.0	5.0
Use of audio/visual aids	5.0	5.0	5.0
Overall effectiveness	5.0	5.0	5

Table 1

Evaluation Results: Training Session I (continued)

	Participant A	Participant B	Average
Sessions	**5.0**	**4.7**	**4.8**
The nature of research	5.0	5.0	5.0
Cooperative efforts with researchers	5.0	5.0	5.0
Needs assessment	5.0	4.0	4.5
Impact of Workshop	**5.0**	**4.0**	**4.5**
Positive impact on my knowledge	5.0	4.0	4.5
Positive impact on my skills	5.0	4.0	4.5
Positive impact on my employment	5.0	4.0	4.5
Positive impact on American Indians with disabilities	5.0	4.0	4.5

knowledgeable about subject, use of audio/visual aids, and overall effectiveness. The overall score given for the presenter on a five-point scale was 5 (see Table 1). Despite this high score, one participant suggested that there be "more dialogue of materials with trainees" when asked for practical suggestions on how to improve the training.

Sessions. As was mentioned earlier, three topics were covered in the training session. Each of these three topics was discussed in separate sessions. These topics were the "Nature of Research," "Cooperative Efforts with Researchers", and "Needs Assessments." The participants gave the sessions an average score of 4.8 on the five-point scale. The session on needs assessment received the lowest score with an average of 4.5 (see Table 1).

Impact of workshop. Impact of the workshop was the last area that the participants were asked to rate on a five-point scale. The four categories that they were asked to rate were "positive impact on my knowledge," "positive impact on my skills," "positive impact on my employment," and "positive impact on American Indians with disabilities." The average score that was given for the impact of the workshop was 4.5. Although high, this score is the lowest given to any of the categories, with the exception of the score given for the facilities.

Comments and suggestions. In addition to rating each of the categories that were discussed above, the participants were asked to give their comments and suggestions about the training session. The first question that the participants were asked to respond to was, "What are the strengths of this training?" In response to this question, one of the participants wrote, *"How it applies to Native American communities."* The other participant wrote, *"The nature of research and the presentation of materials."* The second question that the participants were asked was, "What were the weaknesses of this training?" One of the participants simply wrote, *"None,"* in responding to this question. The other participant answered this question by writing, *"The facility, temperature."* The participants were also asked to respond to the question, "What practical suggestions do you have to improve the training?" The answers to this question were, *"If possible, come on-site (Eagle Butte),"* and *"More dialogue of materials with trainees."* The following question was, "What topics should be covered in future trainings?" One participant answered, *"I'm not sure since research is a new area for me."* The other respondent wrote, *"Writing grants."* The next question that the participants were asked was, "Would you recommend this training to your colleagues? Why or why not?" Both of the participants said that they would

recommend the training to their colleagues; however, only one of them explained why. The person who explained the answer wrote, *"My colleagues would benefit from the organization of materials and would be able to impact change for the disabled."* Finally, the participants were asked if they had any other comments. Only one of the participants responded to this question and that person wrote, *"This is a wonderful means to effect change."*

Training Session II

The second training session was conducted on November 14 and 15, 1996, at the workplace of the consumer-researcher trainees in Eagle Butte, South Dakota. The title of this training session was "Developing a Research Proposal." The three discussion topics during this training session were research proposals, computers, and library and information services.

The first section of the training, research proposals, outlined the sections of a proposal and gave examples of useful items to include. Sample budgets and timetables were discussed. In addition, the presenter pointed out that a proposal serves as a work plan that staff can use to coordinate their efforts. Finally, checklists and a funding documentation form were provided for the trainees to copy and use.

In the second section of the training, the various uses of computers, the preparation of data to be processed by computers, and the different choices faced when using computers were discussed. Sample printouts that illustrated the capabilities of various computer program packages were given to the trainees. In short, explanations that attempted to take the "mystery" out of computers by defining computer-related terms and describing the equipment available were given.

Library and information centers, the topics of the third section, are important community resources for the sharing of information. In this section of the training the steps needed to develop a community library were discussed. In addition, the kinds of information available, such as printed works, library guides, government documents, data bases, bibliographies on American Indian topics, and major library collections of American Indian materials were discussed. It was also pointed out that the library can be an important source of information for determining the amount of existing knowledge on a topic, the characteristics of a population, and examples of similar research approaches.

Participants' Evaluation

As was done following the first training session, the participants were asked to evaluate the second training session. The results of the evaluation are discussed below. In addition, Table 2 displays the scores that were given by both of the participants.

Training. As was mentioned above, the topics that were discussed in the training session were research proposals, computers, and library and information services. The participants were asked to rate the overall effectiveness of the training based on the nine categories listed in Table 2. The average score for this section of the evaluation was 4.4 on a 5-point scale. Please refer to Table 2 to review the scores given for each question.

Facilities. As was mentioned above, the training session was held at the workplace of the consumer-researcher trainees in Eagle Butte, South Dakota. This was a change from the first training session which was conducted in Rapid City, South Dakota at the Black Hills Training Center. The trainees had asked that the training sessions be moved to Eagle Butte since they both live in this town. In addition, both of the trainees worked

Table 2

Evaluation Results: Training Session II

	Participant A	Participant B	Average
Training	**5.0**	**4.5**	**4.8**
Quality of information provided	4.0	5.0	4.5
Appropriate topics	4.0	5.0	4.5
Amount of information provided	4.0	4.0	4.0
Organization and structure	4.0	4.0	4.0
Handouts	4.0	5.0	4.5
Met stated goals and objectives	5.0	5.0	5.0
Content matched agenda	5.0	5.0	5.0
Overall quality of speakers/sessions	4.0	4.0	4.0
Overall quality of workshop	4.0	4.0	4.0
Facilities	**4.4**	**5.0**	**4.7**
Geographic location	5.0	5.0	5.0
Physical arrangement of room	4.0	5.0	4.5
Temperature	4.0	5.0	4.5
Lighting	4.0	5.0	4.5
Acoustics/sound	5.0	5.0	5.0
Accessibility for people with disabilities	5.0	5.0	5.0
Meeting room facilities in general	4.0	5.0	4.5
Presenter	**5.0**	**5.0**	**5.0**
Prepared and organized	5.0	5.0	5.0
Knowledgeable about subject	5.0	5.0	5.0
Use of audio/visual aids	5.0	5.0	5.0
Overall effectiveness	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 2

Evaluation Results: Training Session II (continued)

	Participant A	Participant B	Average
Sessions	**4.7**	—	—
Research proposals	5.0	—	—
Computers	4.0	3.0	3.5
Library and information services	5.0	5.0	5.0
Impact of Workshop	**4.5**	**5.0**	**4.8**
Positive impact on my knowledge	4.0	5.0	4.5
Positive impact on my skills	5.0	5.0	5.0
Positive impact on my employment	4.0	5.0	4.5
Positive impact on American Indians with disabilities	5.0	5.0	5.0

at the training site. The average score for this section of the evaluation was 4.1 on a 5-point scale. Please refer to Table 2 to review the scores given for each question.

Presenter. The participants were only asked to comment on four aspects of the presenter. As Table 2 indicates, these aspects were: prepared and organized, knowledgeable about subject, use of audio/visual aids, and overall effectiveness. The average score given for the presenter on a five-point scale was 5 (see Table 2).

Sessions. As was mentioned earlier, three topics were covered in the training session. These topics were "Research Proposals," "Computers", and "Library and Information Services." It is not possible to calculate the average

score for this category as one of the trainees did not rate the research proposals section of the evaluation form. Despite this, Table 2 demonstrates that the trainees did not give the computer section of the training a very high score.

Impact of workshop. Impact of the workshop was the last area that the participants were asked to rate on the five-point scale. The four categories that they were asked to rate were "positive impact on my knowledge," "positive impact on my skills," "positive impact on my employment," and "positive impact on American Indians with disabilities." The average score that was given for the impact of the workshop was 4.75 (see Table 2).

Comments and suggestions. In addition to rating each of the categories that were discussed above, the participants were asked to give their comments and suggestions about the training session. The first question that the participants were asked to respond to was, "What are the strengths of this training?" In response to this question, one of the participants wrote, *"Geared toward Native learning styles."* The other participant wrote, *"Presentation, information for research resources and computer resource."* The second question that the participants were asked was, "What were the weaknesses of this training?" One of the participants wrote, *"More stimulus for dialogue."* The other participant wrote that there was, *"inadequate time for discussion and hands-on with computer."* The participants were also asked to respond to the question, "What practical suggestions do you have to improve the training?" One of the answers to this question was, *"Access to computers (lap top). More discussion in relation to resources."* The other trainee wrote, *"Hand out application of a resource or an example. One like the budget example was excellent."* The following question that was asked of the trainees was, "What topics should be covered in future trainings?" The answers to this question were, *"Basic computer and research"* and *"The*

same." The next question that the participants were asked was, "Would you recommend this training to your colleagues? Why or why not?" Both of the participants said that they would recommend the training to their colleagues; however, only one of them explained why. The person who explained the answer wrote, *"A wonderful mechanism to effect change in communities."* Finally, the participants were asked if they had any other comments. Only one of the participants responded to this question and that person wrote, *"I enjoyed the resource additions in back of sections."*

Training Session III

The third training session was conducted on December 4 and 5, 1996 at the workplace of the consumer-researcher trainees in Eagle Butte, South Dakota. The title of this training session was "Research Design and Data Analysis." The three discussion topics during this training session were survey research, statistics, and cultural arts. Each of these topics is described below.

The first section of this training session focused on survey research. For the purposes of this training session, a survey was defined as a method of collecting data in a consistent way. Survey research was described as being useful for documenting existing community conditions, characteristics of a population, and community opinion. This section of the training session outlined the steps needed to conduct surveys using both the questionnaire and interview methods. Details on preparing questionnaires and interview schedules were presented, along with a comparison of both methods for different community-based situations. It was also pointed out that survey data is not only useful for immediate community development purposes, but

it can also serve the future of a community effort by providing the baseline data needed later to demonstrate progress.

Statistics were the discussion topic for the second section of this training session. This section was a continuation of the research process described in earlier sessions for collecting data. A demonstration on how different types of data can be coded, tabulated, and displayed for communication to others was given. Among the statistical calculations described were: frequencies, percentages, cumulative frequencies, means, medians, modes, standard deviations and cross-tabulations. Several ways of displaying data with graphs and charts were shown.

Cultural arts projects were discussed in the third section of this training session. The reasoning behind the inclusion of the cultural arts, even though they are not directly related to research, was that in some cases, projects such as video documentaries, photo essays, or poetry can provide more powerful information than statistics in terms of better understanding disability issues. In addition, researchers have used video to document needs, collect data, and disseminate research results. Therefore, the AIRRTC researchers felt that it was important to leave this option open to the project participants. In this section, information on organizing people, identifying resources, and defining a cultural or arts project was presented to the participants. Steps were given for accomplishing a project. Specific techniques for tape recording and photography, as well as an overview of video and film documentation were discussed. Other topics that often prove difficult in culture and fine arts projects, such as protecting information, avoiding bias, and developing continued support for the arts, were also covered.

Participants' Evaluation

As was done following the first and second training sessions, the participants were asked to evaluate the session. The results of the evaluation are discussed below. In addition, Table 3 displays the scores that were given by both of the participants.

Training. As was mentioned above, the topics that were discussed in the training session were survey research, statistics, and cultural arts. The nine categories that the participants were asked to rate are listed in Table 3. The average score for this section of the evaluation was 4.5 on a 5-point scale. Please refer to Table 3 to review the scores given for each question.

Facilities. The training session was held at the consumer-researcher trainees' workplace in Eagle Butte, South Dakota. The average score to the facilities was 4.4 on a 5-point scale. This was a slightly better score than was given to the facilities on the evaluation form for Training Session II even though both the second and third training sessions were conducted in the same building. Please refer to Table 3 to review the scores given for each category.

Presenter. The participants were only asked to comment on four aspects of the presenter. As Table 3 indicates, these aspects were: prepared and organized, knowledgeable about subject, use of audio/visual aids, and overall effectiveness. The average score given for the presenter was a 4.4 on a five-point scale (see Table 3).

Sessions. As was mentioned earlier, three topics were covered in the training session. These topics were survey research, statistics, and cultural arts. The average score that was given to the sessions was a 4.3. Table 3 demonstrates that the cultural arts section was the least successful section of the training. The comment below, which also comes from the evaluation,

Table 3

Evaluation Results: Training Session III

	Participant A	Participant B	Average
Training	**4.0**	**5.0**	**4.5**
Quality of information provided	4.0	5.0	4.5
Appropriate topics	4.0	5.0	4.5
Amount of information provided	4.0	5.0	4.5
Organization and structure	4.0	5.0	4.5
Handouts	4.0	5.0	4.5
Met stated goals and objectives	4.0	5.0	4.5
Content matched agenda	4.0	5.0	4.5
Overall quality of speakers/sessions	4.0	5.0	4.5
Overall quality of workshop	4.0	5.0	4.5
Facilities	**4.0**	**4.9**	**4.5**
Geographic location	4.0	5.0	4.5
Physical arrangement of room	4.0	4.0	4.0
Temperature	4.0	5.0	4.5
Lighting	4.0	5.0	4.5
Acoustics/sound	4.0	5.0	4.5
Accessibility for people with disabilities	4.0	5.0	4.5
Meeting room facilities in general	4.0	5.0	4.5
Presenter	**3.8**	**5.0**	**4.4**
Prepared and organized	3.0	5.0	4.0
Knowledgeable about subject	4.0	5.0	4.5
Use of audio/visual aids	4.0	5.0	4.5
Overall effectiveness	4.0	5.0	4.5

Table 3

Evaluation Results: Training Session III (continued)

	Participant A	Participant B	Average
Sessions	**4.0**	**4.7**	**4.3**
Survey research	4.0	5.0	4.5
Statistics	4.0	5.0	4.5
Cultural arts	4.0	4.0	4.0
Impact of Workshop	**4.0**	**5.0**	**4.5**
Positive impact on my knowledge	4.0	5.0	4.5
Positive impact on my skills	4.0	5.0	4.5
Positive impact on my employment	4.0	5.0	4.5
Positive impact on American Indians with disabilities	4.0	5.0	4.5

demonstrates that this participant felt that the cultural arts could be useful but that they were not presented well.

> *The Cultural Arts is somewhat weak in my opinion. This could and should be strong because it relates to one of our greatest challenges--employment. Self-employment is necessary and feasible in many cases. Although this doesn't appear to be important to the research concept, it is important to the VR process. Perhaps this could be eliminated and incorporated into some other training or perhaps teach how to research this issue to promote change within an organization.*

Impact of workshop. Impact of the workshop was the last area that the participants were asked to rate on the five-point scale. The four categories that they were asked to rate were "positive impact on my knowledge,"

"positive impact on my skills," "positive impact on my employment," and "positive impact on American Indians with disabilities." The average score that was given for the impact of the workshop was 4.5 (see Table 3).

Comments and suggestions. In addition to rating each of the categories that were discussed above, the participants were asked to give their comments and suggestions about the training session. The first question that the participants were asked to respond to was, "What are the strengths of this training?" In response to this question, one of the participants wrote, *"The information manual."* The other participant wrote, *"The group is small which encourages ample open discussion."* The second question that the participants were asked was, "What were the weaknesses of this training?" One of the trainees wrote, *"Organization of some materials."* The other trainee gave an extensive quote about the weakness of the cultural arts section (see quote on previous page).

The participants were also asked to respond to the question, "What practical suggestions do you have to improve the training?" The person that answered this question wrote, *"More participant writing from the beginning."* The following question that was asked of the trainees was, "What topics should be covered in future trainings?" Only one of the trainees answered this question and this person wrote, *"In my opinion it's quite extensive on inclusion. Might be, again, some appropriate techniques for writing as the research project is conducted. Perhaps a part of statistics."* The next question that the participants were asked was, "Would you recommend this training to your colleagues? Why or why not?" Both of the participants said that they would recommend the training to their colleagues; however, neither of them explained why. Finally, the participants were asked if they had any other comments. Neither of them gave any additional comments.

Training Session IV

The fourth training session was conducted on February 13 and 14, 1997, at the workplace of the consumer-researcher trainees in Eagle Butte, South Dakota. The title of this training session was "Evaluation and Dissemination." The three discussion topics during this training session were evaluation, research reports, and formal presentations. Each of these topics is described below.

The first section of this training session focused on evaluations. Evaluations were described as being useful in making decisions about the value of a program or the effectiveness of a technique for delivering services. It was pointed out that by assessing programs and improving them, a community can greatly increase the quality of service delivery. The community conducted evaluation can demonstrate program progress according to the goals and views of the community itself.

The topic for the second section of Training Session IV was report writing. This section of the training session described sections of both progress reports and final reports. Participants discussed the importance of sharing research results through report writing. Report writing is an essential part of all research projects that allows the researcher to disseminate important information that comes out of a project.

The final section of Training Session IV focused on formal presentations. Formal presentations are another way to disseminate project results. This section focused on presenting project results at community forums, professional conferences, and at tribal council meetings.

Participants' Evaluation

Training. As was mentioned above, the topics that were discussed in the training session were evaluations, research reports, and formal

presentations. The nine categories that the participants were asked to rate are listed in Table 4. The average score for this section of the evaluation was 4.2 on a 5-point scale. Please refer to Table 4 to review the scores given for each question.

Facilities. The training session was held at the consumer-researcher trainees' workplace in Eagle Butte, South Dakota. The average rating that was given to the facilities was 3.35 on a 5-point scale. One of the trainees gave the facilities much lower scores than the other trainee. This person wrote a note beside this section of the evaluation that said, *"Difficult to do at home without interruptions."* This trainee was referring to the fact that the training session was held at the offices where he/she works. Please refer to Table 4 to review the scores given for each category.

Presenter. As Table 4 indicates, the presenter was evaluated in four categories. The trainees were asked to rate whether the presenter was prepared and organized, knowledgeable about the subject matter, effectively used audio/visual aides, and overall effectiveness. The trainees gave the presenter an average score of 4.4 on a five-point scale.

Sessions. As was described earlier, the fourth training session contained information on evaluations, research reports, and formal presentations. The trainees rated each of these sessions highly. The average score that was given to all of the sessions was 4.5 on a five-point scale (see Table 4).

Impact of workshop. The trainees were asked to rate four areas in relation to the overall impact of the training session. These four areas were: "positive impact on my knowledge," "positive impact on my skills," "positive impact on my employment," and "positive impact on American

Table 4

Evaluation Results: Training Session IV

	Participant A	Participant B	Average
Training	**4.4**	**4.0**	**4.2**
Quality of information provided	5.0	4.0	4.5
Appropriate topics	4.0	4.0	4.0
Amount of information provided	4.0	4.0	4.0
Organization and structure	4.0	4.0	4.0
Handouts	4.0	4.0	4.0
Met stated goals and objectives	5.0	4.0	4.5
Content matched agenda	5.0	4.0	4.5
Overall quality of speakers/sessions	4.0	4.0	4.0
Overall quality of workshop	5.0	4.0	4.5
Facilities	**4.0**	**2.7**	**3.4**
Geographic location	4.0	2.0	3.0
Physical arrangement of room	4.0	4.0	4.0
Temperature	4.0	2.0	3.0
Lighting	4.0	5.0	4.5
Acoustics/sound	4.0	2.0	3.0
Accessibility for people with disabilities	4.0	—	—
Meeting room facilities in general	4.0	4.0	4.0
Presenter	**4.8**	**4.0**	**4.4**
Prepared and organized	5.0	4.0	4.5
Knowledgeable about subject	5.0	4.0	4.5
Use of audio/visual aids	4.0	4.0	4.0
Overall effectiveness	5.0	4.0	4.5

Table 4

Evaluation Results: Training Session IV (continued)

	Participant A	Participant B	Average
Sessions	**5.0**	**4.0**	**4.5**
Evaluation	5.0	4.0	4.5
Research reports	5.0	4.0	4.5
Formal presentations	5.0	4.0	4.5
Impact of Workshop	**4.8**	**5.0**	**4.9**
Positive impact on my knowledge	5.0	5.0	5.0
Positive impact on my skills	5.0	5.0	5.0
Positive impact on my employment	5.0	5.0	5.0
Positive impact on American Indians with disabilities	4.0	5.0	4.5

Indians with disabilities" (see Table 4). The average score that was given for the impact of Training Session 4 was 4.9 on a five-point scale.

Comments and suggestions. In addition to rating each of the categories that were discussed above, the participants were asked to give their comments and suggestions about the training session. The first question that the participants were asked to respond to was, "What are the strengths of this training?" In response to this question, one of the participants wrote, *"Evaluation and presentation resource."* The other participant wrote, *"The greatest strength was how the knowledge is so empowering."* The second question that the participants were asked was, "What were the weaknesses of this training?" One of the trainees wrote, *"Facility room temperature."* The other trainee remarked, *"Lack of consumers."* The participants were also

asked to respond to the question, "What practical suggestions do you have to improve the training?" One trainee wrote, *"Taping the thoughts and ideas in the end of the training."* The other trainee responded, *"Include consumers."* The following question that was asked of the trainees was, "What topics should be covered in future trainings?" Only one of the trainees answered this question and this person wrote, *"I have no opinion on this question."* The next question that the participants were asked was, "Would you recommend this training to your colleagues? Why or why not?" Both of the participants said that they would recommend the training to their colleagues; however, only one explained why. That person wrote, *"It's a means to improving what ever needs to be improved"* Finally, the participants were asked if they had any other comments. The one person who did have an additional comment wrote, *"Consumers as participants is a real plus. This will make organizing the PAC much easier."*

Summary of All Training Sessions

Table 5 displays the average scores for each session as well as the average of the overall training. As demonstrated in the table, the overall impact of the training was very good. In particular, the consumer-researcher trainees felt that the training had a positive impact on their own skills. In terms of the training sessions, the most positive scores were given to the trainings on "The Nature of Research," "Cooperative Efforts with Researchers," and "Needs Assessments." The least effective training sessions were the sessions on "Computers" and "Cultural Arts."

Table 5

Evaluation Results: Average of All Training Sessions

	Session I	Session II	Session III	Session IV	Average
Training	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.2	4.6
Quality of information provided	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Appropriate topics	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5
Amount of information provided	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.3
Organization and structure	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.3
Handouts	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5
Met stated goals and objectives	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.6
Content matches agenda	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.8
Overall quality of speakers/sessions	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0
Overall quality of workshop	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Facilities	4.5	4.7	4.4	3.4	4.2
Geographic location	4.5	5.0	4.5	3.0	4.3
Physical arrangement of room	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.3
Temperature	4.0	4.5	4.5	3.0	4.0
Lighting	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Acoustics/sound	5.0	5.0	4.5	3.0	4.4
Accessibility for people with disabilities	5.0	5.0	4.5	—	4.8
Meeting room facilities in general	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.4
Presenter	5.0	5.0	4.4	4.4	4.7
Prepared and organized	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.6
Knowledgeable about subject	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.8
Use of audio/visual aids	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.0	4.6
Overall effectiveness	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.8
Sessions	4.8	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.5
The nature of research	5.0	—	—	—	5.0

Table 5

Evaluation Results: Average of All Training Sessions (continued)

	Session I	Session II	Session III	Session IV	Average
Cooperative efforts with researchers	5.0	—	—	—	5.0
Needs assessment	5.0	—	—	—	5.0
Research proposals	—	—	—	—	—
Computers	—	3.5	—	—	3.5
Library and information services	—	5.0	—	—	5.0
Survey research	—	—	4.5	—	4.5
Statistics	—	—	4.5	—	4.5
Cultural arts	—	—	4.0	—	4.0
Evaluation	—	—	—	4.5	4.5
Research reports	—	—	—	4.5	4.5
Formal presentations	—	—	—	4.5	4.5
Impact of Workshop	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.9	4.7
Positive impact on my knowledge	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.6
Positive impact on my skills	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.8
Positive impact on my employment	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.6
Positive impact on American Indians with disabilities	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.6

Personal Essays

Pre-Training Personal Essay

Prior to the four training sessions, each of the trainees was asked to write a personal essay. The purpose of the personal essay was to enable the researchers to measure the participants' acquisition of dissemination skills by establishing a baseline representation of the trainees' writing abilities, as well

as obtain qualitative data regarding a "profile" of participants--characteristics of consumer trainees that contribute to successful community research outcomes. The instructions that were given to the trainees were that they write a short essay that included any information about themselves that they wanted to share or that was relevant to their ambitions as researchers. Only one of the participants chose to write the pre-training essay. This essay is below.

> *I am a confident American Indian male that would like to promote any research that would enable other Native Americans to live with their disabilities without shame. I have worked with various individuals that have issues with themselves and I believe I have worked through many issues. I have researched many concepts on how to accept one's self just the way we are. I have a research background in paralegal law. I enjoy doing research and putting together new outlooks. I enjoy new insights and developing new data for Native Americans. I can look forward to working with people and working as a team to generate research.*

Post-Training Personal Essay

Following the four training sessions each of the trainees was asked to write another personal essay. The purpose of writing the post-training personal essay was to compare it with the pre-training personal essay as a method of measuring the participants' acquisition of skills and knowledge, as well as identify characteristics of the consumer trainees which contributed to successful community research outcomes. The instructions that were given to the trainees were that they write a short essay that described their thoughts

on the four training sessions and how the sessions will help them to conduct research in their community. The essays that each of the participants wrote are below.

Participant A:

"Developing Rehabilitation Researchers in the American Indian Community" has proven to be extremely beneficial for me as a Lakota person. My concept of research was, as defined in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, ". . . . critical and exhaustive investigation or experimentation having for its aim the revision of accepted conclusions . . . ." Furthermore, I believed that credible research was done only by the highly educated. This training provided skills for Participatory Action Research, which is a way to effect change. This, changed my entire understanding and attitude regarding research as I learned about the different methods of research. This introduction created excitement from the beginning. The structure of the course, as well as the facilitator, created an atmosphere conducive to learning and being creative. Immediately, I thought of topics for research.

The training began with basic research concepts which included the various types of research and parts of a research plan. The first session offered information regarding where and how to begin the research project by covering the procedure for identifying the goals and objectives of the research or what change would one like to see regarding an issue for a population and does it need to be changed. Information in relation to how to explore related research, forming the Project Advisory

Committee, Needs Assessments, etc. are other areas included in this session.

Session II covered topics relevant to developing a research proposal with an actual development of a proposal and experiencing the proposal process. The experience of brainstorming the definition of the problem was beneficial for not only research but for general problem-solving. The manual will be a valuable resource as the program proceeds with research.

Session III was the most technical portion of the course with information on the actual project design with information and dialog on how to analyze the data, statistics! During this session we developed an actual proposal to do research that we hope will increase consumer/patient/client use of tribal health and social programs.

Session IV, Evaluation and Dissemination, contained the information on the purpose of the evaluation and the different methods to evaluate the project. This was followed by how and what information to compile and how and to whom to present it.

The training was informative of all stages of Participatory Action Research. The information delivered was clear and presented in a culturally relevant manner or cultural issues were considered. The teaching method, actual experience and dialog, is a method which facilitates maximum learning for me. I am looking forward to being involved in actual research. I am appreciating the opportunity to be involved in this remarkable

experience. I recommend the initiation of an extensive marketing campaign to begin; finally grassroots Native Americans can conduct their own research for the good of the people rather than for "a feather in someone's cap."

Participant B:

I learned what I need to do with a research proposal and how to effectively work with our community to develop an effective plan.

I will organize a group of people to support our project. I will develop a written plan and evaluation format to convince our support group this is a good proposal and the end result will benefit our tribe. I will collect data pertinent to our project so that it will be convincing enough to show why this proposal would benefit our community. I will work on a survey to collect enough data for the project. I will be available enough to work on this project to get enough information to make this project successful.

Review of Pre- and Post-Training Presentations

In addition to providing pre- and post-training writing samples, the consumer-researcher trainees were asked to give video-taped presentations before and after the training sessions. As with the pre- and post-training writing samples, the purpose of the presentations was to assist in measuring the participants' acquisition of skills and knowledge, as well as identify characteristics of the consumer-researcher trainees which contributed to successful community research outcomes. In both cases, the consumer-researcher trainees were asked to discuss their knowledge about conducting

research as well as any goals that they had as consumer-researcher trainees. Each presentation that was given, both before and after the training sessions, lasted between five and 10 minutes.

A panel of vocational rehabilitation and research professionals was asked to review both video tapes and comment on the quality of the presentations as well as the acquisition of knowledge from the pre-training presentation to the post-training presentation. The group consisted of four vocational rehabilitation counselors from the Arizona Rehabilitation Services Administration, Department of Economic Security and three researchers from the AIRRTC (not including the authors).

The comments that the panel had about the quality of the presentations primarily focused on the comfort level that the consumer-researcher trainees demonstrated while speaking. For example, one panel member said, *"When [he] started, he had no clue. The second video, he had more goals, poise, and emphasis with his presentation. [She] showed more poise on the first tape, unsure on the second tape."* Another panel member said, *"The second video was an improvement. I saw a lot of sensitivity, more of an understanding [of how] research reaches out to people. The two videos show a contrast in the growth of sensitivity."* Another panel member felt that the presentations needed to have more structure in order to be measured more accurately. Finally, one of the panel members gave an extensive comment on the contrast between the pre-training and post-training presentations. His comments are below.

> *[During the first presentation his] body language was closed, unsure of himself and the topic. During the second presentation, his body language was very open and better understanding of PAR [Participatory Action Research]. [He] said, "disabled persons" on the first tape but I*

couldn't tell if he changed his terminology on the second tape. During the second presentation, I didn't see anything that would indicate that he had or had not learned that concept. The first presentation, [she] gave a good presentation. She knew the kinds of things that she would like to know more about to assist the people with disabilities that she has [a] responsibility to. . . . In the second tape, both of them sounded as though they were giving testimonials about the positive nature of their training.

Based on their comments, there seemed to be a consensus among the panel members that both of the consumer-researcher trainees gained a better understanding of community-based research as a result of the training sessions. For example, one of the panel members said, *"[He], in the first tape, was stumbling around, didn't know what research was and in the second tape, he was. . . .had an idea of what research could be, the language was there. . . . She seemed to have some idea of what research was about, in the second tape she had more of an idea of what research was, how she could conduct it, maybe some ideas for research strategies."* A couple of the panel members commented extensively on the acquisition of knowledge from the pre-training presentation to the post-training presentation. Their comments are listed below.

Going back to the first tape, they didn't seem to have a good idea of what was involved in research, the methods and the specific steps involved. They just talked about confidentiality and trust as something that was apparently a concern to them. So, I thought it was interesting that [she] mentioned that trust and confidentiality were tied to these services the second time and that seemed like a point that they could validate with research and they could investigate with research.

That seemed to show some change and understanding. They both talked about proposals and collecting data, and participatory action research. [She] talked about curriculum design. From the brief presentation, it sounded like they did get a lot more technical, more knowledge. I definitely got that impression that they understood that was involved in research better.

[She] talked about participatory action research training, and she used that term freely, so I really believe that she understands now what that is. She talked about hoping to use the concept to effect more change and that it was important for people to do more research, which really again makes me believe that she really understands the concept of PAR. . . . [She] talked about "research is for the people," giving an historical and present perspective with regard to research and highlighting the notion of participatory action research as something you're doing for yourself and it's not being done by somebody who comes in and does it and then leaves with the data. And it's not being used by, not being available or used or being initiated by persons who are being researched.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

It has been the experience of the AIRRTC researchers that American Indian people in the community can make significant contributions to the design and process of research (see, e.g., Marshall, Johnson, Martin, Saravanabhavan, & Bradford, 1992; Marshall, Day-Davila, & Mackin, 1992; Marshall, Gotto, Pérez Cruz, Flores Rey, & García Juárez, 1996; Marshall, Gotto, & Galicia García, 1997). As a result of these experiences, AIRRTC researchers recognized that with systematic training, American Indians with

disabilities could take a more active role in research that was for and about them. Thus, the goals of the research project described in this paper were to:

1. Develop a consumer-researcher training model with which to systematically train consumers in the process of research.
2. Test the model in one community, Rapid City, South Dakota.
3. Provide technical assistance to the consumer research team as regards conducting a research project in their community, focused on identifying the needs of American Indians with disabilities.
4. Evaluate both the process of training consumers, as well as the outcome of their research effort.

The purpose of this initial report has been to describe and assess the efforts to accomplish Goals 1 and 2, as well as describe the evaluation of the immediate impact of the consumer-researcher training. An evaluation of the long-term impact of the training must wait until the conclusion of the community research effort.

As a whole, this research project to date has been quite successful. The major successes have been that four comprehensive training manuals on community-based research have been developed, training sessions based on these manuals came to fruition, and the consumer-researchers who participated in these training sessions are on the verge of completing their own research project. The formative evaluation surveys, which were completed by the consumer-researcher trainees following each training session, are testimony to the positive outcomes of the training. For example, the data contained within Tables 1 through 4 demonstrate that the consumer-researcher trainees felt that the training they received was excellent. In addition, there is evidence that the consumer-researcher trainees did learn a great deal as a result of participating in the training sessions. For instance,

comparing the pre- and post-training essays of the one trainee who wrote both essays demonstrates that his understanding of community-based research grew considerably. In the pre-training essay, he wrote in generalities about research: *"I have researched many concepts on how to accept one's self just the way we are. . . . I enjoy doing research and putting together new outlooks. I enjoy new insights and developing new data for Native Americans."* However, in the post-training essay, this same person wrote specifically about what he learned and what he planned to do with this knowledge:

> *I will organize a group of people to support our project. I will develop a written plan and evaluation format to convince our support group this is a good proposal and the end result will benefit our tribe. I will collect data pertinent to our project so that it will be convincing enough to show why this proposal would benefit our community. I will work on a survey to collect enough data for the project. I will be available enough to work on this project to get enough information to make this project successful.*

According to the panel of vocational rehabilitation and research professionals who reviewed the pre- and post-training video presentations, these too were evidence that the consumer-researcher trainees gained a great deal of understanding about community-based research. For example, one of the panel members said, *"From the brief presentations, it sounded like they did get a lot more technical, more knowledge. I definitely got that impression, that they understood what was involved in research better."* Another panel member commented, *"He, in the first tape, was stumbling*

around, didn't know what research was and in the second tape, he was. . . . had an idea of what research could be, the language was there."

The most convincing evidence that the training sessions were effective is that the consumer-researchers are on the verge of completing their own research project. With minimal assistance from the AIRRTC researchers, they developed a research proposal, put together a project advisory committee, created a survey, collected data from 174 participants, created a data base, and analyzed the data. The only project activity that remains for them to accomplish is the writing of the final report.

Despite the successful completion of the goals of this project, the AIRRTC researchers would like to acknowledge problems encountered in the research process. For example, due in part to poor time management and an unrealistic time frame, the AIRRTC researchers were not able to fully involve the PAC in the development of the training manuals. As a result, they did not receive potentially valuable comments and/or advice. Another example is that the AIRRTC researchers waited too long to hire an on-site coordinator. This person should have been hired at the beginning of the project. The on-site coordinator could be a valuable resource to a project such as this because he/she is more accessible to the people in the target community than the AIRRTC researchers. Therefore, a lot of time could be saved in both the development of the PAC and the recruitment of participants. In this case, the project was able to be completed without an on-site coordinator. However, based on experience from other projects, the AIRRTC researchers know that a capable on-site coordinator would have helped the project to run much more smoothly.

AIRRTC researchers would like to continue to investigate consumer-researcher training approaches which are congruent with American Indian

cultural values and which promote mutual learning opportunities among consumers, university-based researchers, and the community. This is a valuable process that allows the university-based researchers to give information as well as take it. In addition, as one of the consumer researchers said, *"The greatest strength* [of the training] *was how the knowledge was so empowering."*

RECOMMENDATIONS

Creating the four training manuals and conducting the four training sessions has taught the AIRRTC researchers many lessons about how to successfully develop a community-based consumer-researcher training model. Recommendations for future training efforts in this area include:

1. Solicit the help and advice of people who identify culturally with the trainees.
2. Solicit the help and advice of professionals who work in the field of disabilities.
3. Allow enough time to prepare the training materials in order that the training sessions will run smoothly.
4. Keep the maximum number of trainees to 10 or below since all trainees will need to participate in the community-based research project; having more people involved in the training and in designing the research may prove to be cumbersome. In addition, the ideal minimum number of consumer-researchers would be four people; such a small group would still allow for the creative sharing of ideas. However, this training process has so much to offer a community that

if only one person is committed to the project, it may be worthwhile to conduct the research.

5. Recruit trainees from within one community as this will help to keep the project manageable.
6. Conduct the training sessions in or near the community where the trainees live.
7. Do not conduct the training session in the workplace of the trainees as this can cause distractions to the training sessions.
8. Hire an on-site coordinator who identifies culturally with the target population and who is committed to the project.
9. When planning training or research activities, take the time of year, both environmentally and culturally, into account. For example, do not plan to travel to rural areas of South Dakota in the middle of the winter or plan a training during the Sun Dance.

References

Berger, R. M., & Patchner, M. A. (1988). *Implementing the research plan: A guide for the helping professions.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Berven, N., & Scofield, M. (1982). Nonmetric data-reduction techniques in rehabilitation research. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 25* (5), 297–311.

Fielding, N. G., & Lee, R. M. (Eds.). (1991). *Using computers in qualitative research.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Fitzgerald, M. H., Goebert, D. A., Tipene-Leach, D., & Dever, G. (n.d.). Problem based learning: Application to medical rehabilitation research training. Unpublished manuscript. (Available from the Pacific Basin Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, John A. Burns School of Medicine, University of Hawaii, 226 N. Kuakini Street, Honolulu, HI 96817).

Fowler, F. J., Jr. (1984). *Survey research methods.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Fowler, F. J., Jr., & Mangione, T. W. (1990). *Standardized survey interviewing: Minimizing interviewer-related error.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Graves, W. H. (1992). Participatory research: A partnership among individuals with disabilities, rehabilitation professionals, and rehabilitation researchers. *Rehabilitation Education, 6,* 221–224.

Guyette, S. (1983). *Community-based research: A handbook for Native Americans.* Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles.

Huck, S. W., Cormier, W. H., & Bounds, W. G., Jr. (1974). *Reading statistics and research.* New York: Harper & Row.

Kuhlmann, A. (1992). Collaborative research among the Kickapoo tribe of Oklahoma. *Human Organization, 51* (3), 274–283.

Leedy, P. D. (1993). *Practical research: Planning and design.* (5th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). *Designing qualitative research.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Marshall, C. A., Day-Davila, C. A., & Mackin, D. E. (1992). *The replication of a model for determining community-based needs of American Indians with disabilities through consumer involvement in community planning and change: Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota. Final Report.* Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University, Institute for Human Development, Arizona University Affiliated Program, American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (PO Box 5630, Flagstaff, AZ 86011).

Marshall, C. A., Gotto, G. S., IV, & Galicia García, O. (1997). *Vecinos y rehabilitation: Assessing the needs and resources of indigenous people with disabilities in the Mixteca region of Oaxaca, Mexico.* Final Report. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University, Institute for Human Development, Arizona University Affiliated Program, American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (PO Box 5630, Flagstaff, AZ 86011).

Marshall, C. A., Gotto, G. S., IV, Pérez Cruz, G., Flores Rey, P., & García Juárez, G. (1996). *Vecinos y rehabilitation: Assessing the needs of indigenous people with disabilities in Mexico.* Final Report. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University, Institute for Human Development, Arizona University Affiliated Program, American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (PO Box 5630, Flagstaff, AZ 86011).

Marshall, C. A., Johnson, M. J., Martin, W. E., Jr., Saravanabhavan, R. C., & Bradford, B. (1992). The rehabilitation needs of American Indians with disabilities in an urban setting. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 58* (2), 13–21.

Nichter, M. (1984). Project community diagnosis: Participatory research as a first step toward community involvement in primary health care. *Social Science Medicine, 19* (3), 237–252.

Schacht, R. M., Hickman, R., & Klibaner, A. (1993). *A needs assessment of American Indians with disabilities in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex: Final report, phase I.* Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University, Institute for Human Development, Arizona University Affiliated Program, American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (PO Box 5630, Flagstaff, AZ 86011).

Schacht, R. M., Morris, C., & Gaseoma, L. R. (1994). *A needs assessment of American Indians with disabilities in the Houston metropolitan area and adjacent rural counties.* Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University, Institute for Human Development, Arizona University Affiliated Program, American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (PO Box 5630, Flagstaff, AZ 86011).

Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social sciences.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Wolcott, H. F. (1990). *Writing up qualitative research.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Appendix A

Letters of Support

RAPID CITY
INDIAN HEALTH BOARD
P.O. Box 1608
Rapid City, South Dakota 57709-1608
Telephone (605) 343-2368

February 15, 1993

Ms. Priscilla Sanderson, Director
American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Ctr.
Institute for Human Development/AUAP
Northern Arizona University
P.O. Box 5630
Flagstaff, Arizona 86011

Dear Ms. Sanderson,

The Rapid City Indian Health Board wishes to express it strong support and encouragement for the American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center's proposal for the development of Indian Research Training.

The Rapid City Indian Health Board (RCIHB) serves a large Indian population (est. 12,000) in Pennington County, South Dakota and has contacts with the Tribal Health Departments in the Aberdeen Area. The Aberdeen Area encompasses the four states of South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa. This network can be utilized to identify and recruit potential participants in this program.

The RCIHB has access to training facilities that can be utilized as training sites for this program. The Black Hills Training Center, a national training center for the Indian Health Service, is available as well as new modular building being constructed by the RCIHB at present.

The RCIHB is an active member of the Aberdeen Area Tribal Chairmen's Health Board. The Health Board membership is composed of Tribal Chairmen in the four state region and these leader can be called upon to address health issues of the Indian people.

In closing, the RCIHB is strongly committed to health research and exploring methods of addressing these issues. The proposed program offers an educational system to allow Indian people to address these issues with its own tribal members as researchers.

Respectfully,

Woody Corbine

Woody Corbine,
Executive Director

CHAIRMAN
Gregg J. Bourland

SECRETARY
Arlene Thompson

TREASURER
Benita Clark

VICE-CHAIRMAN
Lanny LaPlante

CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE

P.O. Box 590
Eagle Butte, South Dakota 57625
(605) 964-4155
Fax: (605) 964-4151

TRIBAL COUNCIL MEMBERS

DISTRICT 1
Raymond Uses The Knife Jr.
Vernon Mestes

DISTRICT 2
Ted Knife Sr.

DISTRICT 3
Maynard Dupris
Ed Widow

DISTRICT 4
Robert Lofton Sr.
Gilbert Red Dog Sr.
Orville LaPlante
Arlee High Elk

DISTRICT 5
Marlin Miner Sr.
Sam Annis
Robert Chasing Hawk
Lanny LaPlante

DISTRICT 6
Joan LeBeau
Louis DuBray

January 5, 1996

Ms. Julie Anna Clay
Research Specialist
Northern Arizona University
P.O. Box 5630
Flagstaff, AZ 86011-5630

Dear Ms. Clay:

Thank you for your letter of December 27, 1995 in which you asked if our Tribe would be willing to designate someone as a member of your Project Advisory Committee for the project of "Developing Rehabilitation Researchers from the American Indian Community." We would be happy to assist your organization as a member of your Project Advisory Committee. We are in the process of hiring staff for our newly funded Vocational Rehabilitation Program. As soon as this process is complete, I will designate the Program Director to represent our Tribe on your Committee.

When-ever you call the Project Advisory Committee together for meetings perhaps some travel arrangements can be planned. We are about 170 miles east of Rapid City. This fact, along with the decreasing federal funding, makes us very aware of our budget constraints.

Sincerely,

Gregg J. Bourland

The blue represents the thunder clouds above the world where live the thunder birds who control the four winds. The rainbow is for the Cheyenne River Sioux People who are keepers of the Most Sacred Calf Pipe, a gift from the White Buffalo Calf Maiden. The eagle feathers at the edges of the rim of the world represent the spotted eagle who is the protector of all Lakota. The two pipes fused together are for unity. One pipe is for the Lakota, the other for all the other Indian Nations. The yellow hoops represent the Sacred Hoop, which shall not be broken. The Sacred Calf Pipe Bundle in red represents Wakan Tanka—the Great Mystery. All the colors of the Lakota are visible. The red, yellow, black and white represent the four major races. The blue is for heaven and the green for Mother Earth.

EMPLOYMENT RESOURCES

providing employment opportunities for people with disabilities

March 13, 1996

Ms. Julie Clay
AIRRTC
Northern Arizona University
P.O. Box 5630
Flagstaff, AZ - 86011-5630

Dear Ms. Clay:

I received your letter regarding the Project Advisory Committee for the consumer-based community research project.

I would be happy to assist you in your endeavor to identify Native American with disabilities and place them into gainful employment.

The research your advocating will be a major effort in this direction.

Again, I would be honored to serve on your Project Advisory Committee.

Please note the change in address and phone number on the letterhead.

Sincerely,

Ron Dolin
Employment Resource Manager

RD/lmm

103A New York Street • Rapid City, South Dakota 57701 • (605) 341-5868

Behavior Management

350 Elk Street
Rapid City, SD 57701
(605)343-7262
FAX (605) 343-7293

March 13, 1996

Julie Anna Clay
Research Specialist
Northern Arizona University
Institute for Human Development
P.O. Box 5630
Flagstaff, Arizona 86011-5630

RE: Letter of March 1, 1996

Dear Ms. Clay:

I would be interested in being a member of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) for the American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center. Please call me at (605) 399-9890 or write me at 124 East St. Joseph Street, Rapid City, South Dakota 57701, with more information regarding this committee.

Also, please correct the spelling of my name from Nechling to Mechling. Thank you for your assistance and information.

Sincerely,

Patty Mechling

Patty Mechling, CSW, PIP
Director
IMPACT-West Program
Behavior Management Systems

PM/ja

LETTERS\031396.PM

MAINSTREAM
111 North Street
Rapid City, SD 57701
(605)343-0650
FAX (605) 342-3692

NORTHERN HILLS
1340 10th Street
Spearfish, SD 57783
(605)642-2777
FAX (605)642-9356

SOUTHERN HILLS
Canyon View Circle #3
Hot Springs, SD 57747
(605)745-6222
FAX (605)745-4930

IMPACT - WEST
124 East St. Joe
Rapid City, SD 57701
(605)399-9890
FAX (605) 399-9892

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B

Interview Questions with KOSZ Radio

KOSZ Radio Interview Questions
February 7, 1996 7:30 a.m.

Persons present:
Priscilla Sanderson, AIRRTC Director
Julie Clay, co-PI
Malcolm Benally, Research Assistant

1. What is the AIRRTC?
Priscilla will respond.

2. What does it do and who is involved?
Priscilla will respond.

3. What is the project that you're currently working on and why are you seeking help from South Dakota American Indians?
This project proposes to develop a community-based consumer-researcher training model. A consumer-research team will then conduct research in its local community, providing information regarding the specific community's rehabilitation needs and generating data regarding the effectiveness of the training model.

The purpose of this research is to: (1) develop a consumer-researcher training model with which to systematically train consumers in the process of research, (2) test the model in one community, Rapid City, South Dakota, (3) provide technical assistance to the consumer research team conducting a research project in their community, focused on identifying the needs of American Indians with disabilities, and (4) evaluate both the process of training consumers, as well as the outcome of their research effort.

South Dakota was asked to participate because the AIRRTC is a nationwide project and in its 13 year history, has not conducted research in the Dakotas. One of our national advisory board members strongly recommended that we do research in South Dakota. Dr. Catherine Marshall approached the Rapid City folks and they agreed to participate. Thus the target community, as per our grant proposal, is Rapid City.

4. Who do you need, in terms of South Dakotans, to assist with this project?
There are three main populations form South Dakota who need to be involved with the project. The first is the Indian Leadership which includes tribal leaders and tribal members with disabilities and their families. Without their support the project will not work. The second group is the project advisory committee comprising of local Indian leaders; representatives of rehabilitation, and education programs; and consumer groups. The PAC will assist the project staff by providing input and direction of the project's objectives. The final group is the consumer-researchers who are the heart of the project. The people who are chosen for the training will influence future American Indian consumer researcher by providing a model. This model will be offered to other communities for training purposes. The outcome of this model will be trained consumer researchers who will be able to positively influence their communities.

5. How long has this project been going on and how long will it continued?
The project officially started at the end of September. Letters to tribal chairpersons were sent last this past December inviting them to be PAC members. In January letters of invitation to be PAC members were sent to numerous organizations including the two tribal vocation rehabilitation programs, the four tribal colleges, independent living centers, and the consumer group, the Quad Squad. The Quad Squad is a group of tribal member with the disabilities from each reservation in South Dakota. The consumer researcher project is a four year project.

6. How can interested parties contact you?
People can contact Malcolm or I at the AIRRTC by phone (520) 523-4791 (Voice), (520)523-1695 (TDD) or (5203) 523-9127 (FAX) The AIRRTC has an 800 number which is 1-800-553-0714. Finally my direct line is (520)523-1340. If people want to write us, our address is:
American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center
Institute for Human Development
Arizona University Affiliated Program
Northern Arizona University
PO BOX 5630
Flagstaff, Az 86001-5630

Appendix C

Press Release

NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

1899 1999

TRADITION • INNOVATION

NEWS

Jan. 18, 1996

CONTACT: Julie Clay, researcher for American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, at 1-800-523-0714

Northern Arizona University researchers seek help from South Dakota American Indians with disabilities

FLAGSTAFF, Ariz. — South Dakota American Indians with disabilites are needed to help find ways to make their own voices heard in defining their rehabilitation needs and solutions.

Linking with South Dakota American Indians with disabilities, to create methods for them to speak for themselves, is the goal of a Northern Arizona University research project for which Native people are being recruited.

This community-based research project will be a first-of-its-kind with American Indians with disabilities as active participants.

The project is being conducted by the American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (AIRRTC). AIRRTC is based at the Institute for Human Development at NAU.

Two AIRRTC researchers, Catherine Marshall and Julie Clay, who is a member of the Omaha Tribe, are implementing the four-year consumer-based community research project. Since 1983, the AIRRTC, a non-profit organization, has practiced participatory research with American Indian communities on reservations and in urban areas throughout the United States.

Clay said the research project is a "commitment towards improving the lives of American Indians within their own communities," where consumers or members of the community, working with AIRRTC researchers, define their own needs. She said she sees this project as another step in empowering American Indians with disabilities to "speak for themselves."

People with a wide range of disabilities, such as severe physical disabilities, emotional disorders, learning disabilities are encouraged to take part in this project.

Anyone interested in being a consumer-researcher or a member of the project's advisory committee, or who would like any information regarding the project, please contact Julie Clay at 1-800-523-0714 at the AIRRTC at NAU in Flagstaff, Ariz.

— 30 —

OFFICE OF
PUBLIC AFFAIRS

PO Box 4133
Flagstaff, AZ 86011-4133
(520) 523-2282 fax (520) 523-9353

Appendix D

Pre-Training Interview/Profile

Developing Rehabilitation Researchers from the American Indian Community

Pre-Training Interview/Profile

American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center
Institute for Human Development / Arizona University Affiliated Program
Northern Arizona University

Demographic Information

Instructions: The purpose of this interview is to give the research trainers information about you. This will help them to better understand where to focus their attention. It is important that the training sessions address the needs of the participants. With this in mind, please answer the questions to the best of your ability giving only one answer for each question.

1) Name:

_____
First Middle Last

2) Address:

_____
Street/PO Box City State Zip Code

3) Telephone: (_____)_____

4) Gender: Female_____ Male_____

5) Date of Birth: _____/_____/_____
M D Y

6) Marital Status: Single_____ Married_____ Widowed_____
Divorced_____ Other_____

7) Education (Last level completed):
Grade School_____ Junior High _____
High School _____ GED _____
Associates _____ Bachelors _____
Masters _____ PhD _____
Other_____

8) Employed: Yes_____ No_____

8a) If employed what is your occupation/profession:

_____

9) Tribal affiliation:

Cheyenne River Tribe _____
Pine Ridge Ogalala Tribe _____
Rosebud Tribe _____
Sisseton-Wahpeton Tribe_____
Standing Rock Tribe _____
Yankton Tribe _____
Crow Creek Tribe _____
Lower Brule Tribe _____
Flandreau Santee Tribe _____
Other_____

10) Disability:

Amputation	_____	Autism	_____
Bipolar Disorder	_____	Blind	_____
Cerebral Palsy	_____	Chemical Dependency	___
Deaf	_____	Depression	_____
Diabetes	_____	Downs Syndrome	_____
Epilepsy	_____	Hemiplegia	_____
Muscular Distrophy	____	Paraplegia	_____
Polio	_____	Poor Vision	_____
Quadriplegia	_____	Schizophrenia	_____
Spina Bifida	_____		

Other_____

Personal Commentary

Instructions: The following questions will help us to understand what you hope to gain from the training sessions and help us to decide what to emphasize in the training sessions in order to meet your goals. Please answer each question as thoroughly as possible.

1) What do you think this project is about?

2) What are your goals for this training project?

3) What has been your experience with research?

4) What contributions can you make to the research team?

5) What concerns would you like to see addressed in regards to conducting research as American Indians who have disabilities?

6) How did you become interested in this project?

Developing Rehabilitation Researchers from the American Indian Community

American Indian Rehabilitation Research and Training Center
Institute for Human Development / Arizona University Affiliated Program
Northern Arizona University

Personal Essay

Instructions: Pleas give a 1- 2 page description of yourself that includes any information about yourself that you would like to share or that is relevant to your ambitions as a researcher.

RESEARCH SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

By Greeley, A. T., Johnson, E., Seem, S., Braver, M., Dias, L.,
Evans, K., Kincade, E., & Pricken, P.
Modified by George S. Gotto, IV

This scale has been developed to measure the confidence individuals from many different fields of study have in their ability to do different research tasks, particularly to complete a dissertation. As you answer any particular question, think about the activity necessary to conduct research in your own field, particularly if there are a number of activities (typically listed in parentheses) on which to base your response.

Think about your level of confidence in your ability to perform each behavior listed and place a number in the blank to the right of the item indicating the degree of confidence in your ability to successfully perform that behavior. Use the following scale to make your ratings.

0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
No confidence			Moderate confidence					Complete confidence		

How confident are you in your overall ability to:

1. Complete a significant research project? _____
2. Follow ethical principles of research _____
3. Brainstorm areas in the literature to read about _____
4. Conduct a computer search of the literature in a particular area _____
5. Locate references by manual search _____
6. Find needed articles which are not available in your library _____
7. Evaluate journal articles in terms of the theoretical approach, experimental design and data analysis techniques _____
8. Participate in generating collaborative research ideas _____

9.	Work interdependently in a research group	_____
10.	Discuss research ideas with peers	_____
11.	Consult senior researchers for ideas	_____
12.	Decide when to quit searching for related research/writing	_____
13.	Decide when to quite generating ideas based on your literature review	_____
14.	Synthesize current literature	_____
15.	Identify areas of needed research, based on reading the literature	_____
16.	Develop a logical rationale for your particular research idea	_____
17.	Generate researchable questions	_____
18.	Organize your proposed research ideas in writing	_____
19.	Effectively edit your writing to make it logical and succinct	_____
20.	Present your research idea orally or in written form to an advisor or group	_____
21.	Utilize criticism from reviews of your idea	_____
22.	Choose an appropriate research design	_____
23.	Choose methods of data collection	_____
24.	Be flexible in developing alternative research strategies	_____
25.	Choose measures of dependent/independent variables	_____
26.	Choose appropriate data analysis techniques	_____
27.	Obtain approval to pursue research (e.g., approval from Human Subject's committee, Animal Subject's committee, special approval for fieldwork, etc.)	_____

28. Obtain appropriate subjects, general supplies, and/or equipment _____

29. Train assistants to collect data _____

30. Perform experimental procedures _____

31. Ensure data collection is reliable across trial, raters, and equipment _____

32. Supervise assistants _____

33. Attend to all relevant details of data collection _____

34. Organize collected data for analysis _____

35. Use computer software to prepare texts (word processing) _____

36. Use computer software to generate graphics _____

37. Use a computer for data analysis _____

38. Develop computer programs to analyze data _____

39. Use an existing computer package to analyze data _____

40. Interpret and understand statistical printouts _____

41. Organize manuscript according to appropriate professional format and standards _____

42. Report results in both narrative and graphic form _____

43. Synthesize results with regard to current literature _____

44. Identify and report limitations of study _____

45. Identify implications for future research _____

46. Design visual presentations (posters, slides, graphs, pictures) _____

47. Orally present results to your research group or department _____

48. Orally present results at a regional/national meeting _____

49. Defend results to a critical audience _____

50. Write manuscript for publication _____

51. Please rate how confident you are in your overall ability to complete a significant research project _____

Appendix E

Formative Evaluation

Developing Rehabilitation Researchers from the American Indian Community

Evaluation

Training Session #1: Overview of the Research Process

Rapid City, South Dakota - October 17 & 18, 1996

Training

		Poor				Excellent
1.	Quality of information provided	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Appropriate topics	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Amount of information provided	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Organization and structure	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Handouts	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Met stated goals and objectives	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Content matched agenda	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Overall quality of speakers/sessions	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Overall quality of workshop	1	2	3	4	5

Facilities

1.	Geographic location	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Physical arrangement of room	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Temperature	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Lighting	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Acoustics/sound	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Accessibility for people with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Meeting room facilities in general	1	2	3	4	5

Presenter

1.	Prepared and organized	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Knowledgeable about subject	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Use of audio/visual aids	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Overall effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5

Sessions

1.	The Nature of Research	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Cooperative Efforts with Researchers	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Needs Assessments	1	2	3	4	5

Impact of Workshop

1.	Positive impact on my knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Positive impact on my skills	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Positive impact on my employment	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Positive impact on American Indians with disabilities	1	2	3	4	5

Comments and Suggestions

1. What were the strengths of this training?

2. What were the weaknesses of this training?

3. What practical suggestions do you have to improve the training?

4. What topics should be covered in future trainings?

5. Would you recommend this training to your colleagues? Why or why not?

   ❒ Yes

   ❒ Maybe

   ❒ No

6. Other comments:

ISBN 1-888557-76-1